

REMARKS

The comments of the applicant below are each preceded by related comments of the examiner (in small, bold type).

2. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 35 refers to a "first agent" in claim 30. However, claim 30 has two first agents: a first network agent and a first processing agent. It cannot be determined which agent claim 35 refers to.

For the purpose of examination on the merits, claim 35 is deemed to refer to a first network agent.

Claim 35 has been amended.

4. Claims 1-4, 8-15, 19-23, 27-30, and 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brown et al (Brown hereinafter).

With reference to claim 1, Brown shows an apparatus for creating a system comprising: *a first network agent* [See protocol processing module (PPM) 266, Fig. 8. Each PPM is in the network of Fig. 8]; *a second network agent* [See TELNET PPSN in Fig. 8]; *a processing agent to process receive data, process a protocol in connection with the data, and transmit the data to the second network- agent* [See PPM 250, Fig. 8. PPM 250 processes TELNET protocol and sends data to PPSN], *in which the processing agent also sends one or more events to the first network agent upon a change in the data being transmitted* [Telnet protocol is bidirectional; there is a return message ("event") from a server, through the PPM 250, when it relays, to the server, newly transmitted data from the first agent ("upon a change in the data being transmitted"). Telnet server is inherent to any system in which a telnet client that is in operation].

Brown does not disclose or suggest a processing agent to receive data, process a protocol in connection with the data, and transmit the data to the second network agent, in which the processing agent also "generates and sends one or more events to the first network agent upon a change in the data being transmitted," as recited in amended claim 1.

If the examiner contends that Brown's softblock 266, softblock 250, and a Telnet server correspond to the "first network agent," "processing agent," and "second network agent" of claim 1, respectively, then the softblock 250 does not send one or more events to the softblock

266 upon a change in the data being transmitted. Without conceding the examiner's point, even if the softblock 250 receives return messages from the Telnet server and forwards the return messages to the softblock 266, the return messages do not originate at the softblock 250.

Claims 11, 22, 30, and 37 are patentable for at least similar reasons as claim 1.

Claims 2-10, 12-21, 23-29, and 31-36 are patentable for at least the same reasons as the claims on which they depend.

Any circumstance in which the applicant has addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner. Any circumstance in which the applicant has made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims. Any circumstance in which the applicant has amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Enclosed is a \$120 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/21/2006

Rex I. Huang
Rex I. Huang
Reg. No. 57,661

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906